



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

test against current methods of teaching English.

Professor Cross's paper was discussed in an editorial in *The New York Times* on June 16, 1908. I quote a part:

But teaching Greek literature in English translations is, at best, dry business. Mr. G. H. LEWES showed its futility when he took WORDSWORTH's line

The river wanders at its own sweet will
and observed that, translated into a foreign tongue, it would assume some such wooden form as,

The river self-impelled pursues its course.

While study of that supreme work of translation, the English Bible, would fit admirably into Prof. Cross's plan, he may provide no substitute for a first-hand knowledge of HOMER's beautifully articulated Greek. The text books that teach it, though discarded by most schools, are still available to the rare student with the desire and the courage "to study them up" by himself.

C. K.

A BROADER APPROACH TO GREEK

(Concluded from page 85)

Now that it would be highly desirable for a student to be master of such a body of words as I have here tried to indicate, and to be able also to derive many other words from them is a matter about which there can hardly be any difference of opinion. But I expect to hear doubts expressed as to the wisdom of attempting to memorize lists of words. I anticipate objections as to the *tour de force* of memory necessary to master such lists. I expect to hear objections as to parrot-like cramming and the like. To all this I can only reply here by a declaration of faith. I believe from my experience that such lists of words *can* be memorized, and when once properly memorized are never wholly forgotten. I do not think that with a youth of ordinary intellect it requires any particular *tour de force* of memory to master such words, and I deny that acquiring words is parrot work, if by that is meant the mere articulation of words without proper apprehension of their meaning. Learning a Greek vocabulary is not a mere matter of superimposition of word upon word and of mastering a new set of symbols for an old set of ideas. The confines of the Greek word do not always coincide with those of the English word, and vocabulary work has an educational value in itself in that it leads to a more accurate definition of elementary concepts. For the word *ἀρετή*, for instance, the student will not find any one word in English that adequately represents it, nor for the word *σωφροσύνη*, "a peculiarly Greek concept which cannot be adequately rendered in any other language". In regard to the passions this word means self-restraint, in regard to pleasures it is moderation and temperance, in regard to demeanor it is modesty. The exercise of determining the full meaning of such words, of tracing their boundaries and noting how they recede within or advance beyond the boundaries of the English terms is a most valuable exercise for inculcating that accuracy of thinking

without which no mind can be said to be trained. But apart from this educational value and merely as propaedeutic to further work in the language I am convinced that vocabulary work *pays*. We have Greek word-lists to teach the first year men at Princeton, and those who learn them—or rather those who *have* learned them (*οἱ μεμαθηκότες*) will tell you that it pays. To the beginner their more experienced brethren are willing to say

maestumque timorem

mittite: forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit.

I believe that it is as sensible and economical to secure an adequate vocabulary in beginning to read as it is for a builder to bring to his building site an adequate supply of material in beginning to build, and the plan of beginning with a meager supply of words is as foolish and wasteful as it would be if a builder should start building with a few bricks or stones and keep running off to the brick-yard or quarry for each single brick or stone as he happened to need it. I believe that a certain amount of material must be stored in the memory. Before the synthetic processes can begin there must be something to synthesize. I believe that Mnemosyne was and is yet the mother of the Muses. I read the other day some striking remarks on the propriety of giving the memory something to do, that deserve to be quoted. They are from the pen of Professor Gayley, Professor of English Literature in the University of California. "If fewer things were despatched", says Professor Gayley, "and if more were entrusted to the memory, there would be something to assimilate, and time to assimilate it; there would be less dyspepsia and more muscle. Teachers and parents are over-considerate nowadays of the memory in children; they approach it gingerly; they have feared so much to wring its withers that in most children the memory has grown too soft for saddling. In our apprehension lest pupils turn out parrots, we have too often turned them out loons. . . . With all our study of children and our gabble about methods of teaching them, while we insist properly enough that youth is the seed-time of observation, we seem to have forgotten that it is also the harvest-time of memory". And so until some one invents a hypodermic syringe for injecting words into the veins of memory we must expect to expend some effort in acquiring a language.

As to the methods to be employed in securing the firm lodgment of the words in the mind of the students, I need not enlarge here. Oral quizzes, written tests, sight translation containing the words used, composition oral and written, all these will be employed by the resourceful teacher. In the matter of written tests I venture to mention a plan used by a teacher who used to send us some of our best students at Cornell, a plan which I found to work

well in my own teaching. Dictate 20 or 25 Greek words, numbering each one, and ask the students to write down the English equivalents in a numbered column. Then dictate the same number of English words and have the students write the Greek equivalents in another column. Have the papers exchanged and as you read off the correct answers, have the errors marked. Have the proper deductions made for errors and the totals computed and called off. This plan stimulates a healthy rivalry among the students and proves very effective.

If we could only get the universities to publish and approve an adequate list of words, and if they would base all the Greek composition set for entrance on such a list, the student would have a very obvious incentive to master the vocabulary. Still another inducement would be afforded if the translation of passages at sight were made part of the entrance requirements. I am not sure but that in the end the translation should be made nearly all sight, as I understand Professor Lodge advocates.

As to the time when this deliberate and systematic attempt to master an adequate supply of words should be made, that might be a matter for experience to determine. For myself I am pretty strongly of the opinion that it should be begun as soon after the student has finished his Beginners' Book as possible. I do not think that it would be well to attempt it earlier. I do not think it is wise to undertake too much in the way of vocabulary in the Beginners' Book. But I do think that the vocabulary of Beginners' Books might be improved. I very much doubt whether the vocabulary of a Beginners' Book should be constituted as if the first four books of the Anabasis were all of Greek that had come down to us. I believe that the vocabulary should be selected with a more liberal purpose as if the student were being prepared to read Greek rather than to read the Anabasis. At present the indictment lies fairly against our Beginners' Books that they prepare to read Xenophon rather than to read Greek. As compared with the Beginners' Books in use in the English schools my feeling is that our books are inferior in this respect.

One other matter which I cannot refrain from referring to here, and which I believe to be second only in importance to the acquisition of a proper vocabulary, is the matter of phrases. I believe that it would be of the very greatest advantage to the student if he were required to learn phrases from the very beginning of his work in Greek, and that the advantage would at the same time be very far-reaching. There would be, in the first place, the obvious advantage of increased facility in reading because of the actual recurrence of such phrases, if they were well chosen from those most in use. But greater than this advantage would be that which would result from the quickening of the student's

sensitivity to Greek phrase-form, and the stimulus it would give to phraseologic reading, phraseologic apprehension. This matter of picking up a sentence by phrases instead of word by word is of cardinal importance for facile reading. Phrases constitute the primary syntheses in any language, and the facile reader is he who is acquainted with a goodly store of these to begin with, and with the prevailing *form* of these syntheses. You have only to compare your own method in reading with that of your students when next you have them doing sight translation, to appreciate what I mean when I speak of the importance of phraseologic apprehension in reading. Whereas you pick up the words half a dozen at a time, a handful at a time, your student picks them up one by one. Whereas you hover over the words, as it were, and grasp them with an inclusive comprehension, your student flounders in the midst of them. He cannot perform the short bustard-flight that is necessary to carry him from the beginning to the end of a phrase. And the greatest value which I believe would result from the learning by the student of a generous store of phrases is not the obvious one that depends on the recurrence of the actual phrases as so many isles of light on a dim page, but that which would result from the student becoming more sensitive to phrase-form and more expert in taking phrases at a bound.

One danger in learning phrases that should be avoided is that of bolting the phrase. By bolting the phrase I mean the habit so many students have of taking a phrase *holus bolus* without analysis. This they are almost sure to do when they do not know the elements (words) of which the phrases are composed and have the meaning of the phrase as a whole conveniently supplied to them in the notes. In this respect many of our editions of the Anabasis give to the student a debilitating sort of aid that is no-wise different from that which he receives from a translation. Take for instance the phrase ἀνὰ κράτος. The student is told in the notes that this means "at full speed". He accepts that meaning. He is perfectly willing to take the editor's word for it, and inasmuch as the word κράτος does not occur in the Anabasis except in the phrases ἀνὰ κράτος or κατὰ κράτος, he never does find out that κράτος really means 'strength', or 'power'. Hence when I ask Freshmen what the word κράτος means, they either do not know at all or answer 'speed'. This is why, while I should strongly advocate the memorizing of phrases, I should not advocate it apart from systematic work with vocabulary. There is the same objection to learning phrases without a knowledge of their constituent elements as there is to learning compound words without a knowledge of the simple words of which they are composed. The student bolts in either case and the result is mal-assimilation and intellectual dyspepsia.

Another important advantage of having a generous store of phrases in the mind is that they would furnish the student with concrete examples of case and prepositional usage, matters concerning which the student's knowledge is generally deficient. "Examples are often of more help than the statement of a rule". "An ounce of example is worth a pound of precept".

This, then, is the gist of the recommendation I should like to offer for the better preparation of students for their college work in Greek. To put the matter in simplest terms, I should advocate the compilation by a committee representing the schools, and universities, of (1) a body of simple uncompounded prose words, (2) a statement of important principles of word derivation, (3) a body of representative phrases. Also, I should recommend that all the Greek composition set for entrance and all the sight translation set for entrance be based on the vocabulary so put forth.

Perhaps some of you, calling to mind the amount of difficulty that you yourselves experienced in beginning Lysias or Plato in college, may be inclined to think that I have exaggerated the difficulties and temptations of the average student at this point. But I should caution you against taking your own experience as a valid criterion. Students that develop into classical teachers are more than likely to have been different from the average matriculant. Thanks to some careful teacher or perhaps because of some gracious principle of fore-ordination whereby you were predestined to be saved, you were much more thorough in your methods from the beginning. You would probably be found among the saving remnant, the 11 out of the 172 mentioned above, who did not use 'trots'. When you came to a compound word or a derived word in the Anabasis, you probably looked up the derivation. When you learned a new word, you probably learned the broad fundamental meaning of the word and not merely the meaning which it might happen to have in the passage where you found it. Hence you brought with you to the reading of your college authors a much better vocabulary than the average student. Hence I doubt whether you can really appreciate the difficulty entailed on the average student because of deficiency of vocabulary. Even to the instructor in the university the deficiency of the student in this regard may not be apparent. For unless he happens to make formal tests or attempts to do sight translation he is not likely to be aware of the pitiful paucity of words known by the students. Before coming away from Princeton I made one or two tests which have a bearing on this point. I mentioned above a list of more common neuters in *os* of the third declension. I submitted this list—an exceedingly important list for any one to know, since they enter into the composition of so many words—to groups

from the second, fourth, and sixth divisions of Freshmen Greek. The second division men knew on an average 18 words out of the 56, the fourth division men 17, the sixth division men 14, an average for all of about 16 words out of the 56. Also, I made a similar test on the masculines of the second declension. The men from the second division knew 28 words of the first 69 of my list, the men from the fourth 22, and the men from the sixth 19 words. These words can not fairly be considered rare. I cite those under the letter *to* to give you an idea of how they run.

ἀγαθός	αἰσχρός	ἄξιος
ἄγγελος	αἶτιος	ἀργυρῆς
ἀγρός	ἄκρος	ἀριθμῶς
ἀγριος	ἀλλότριος	ἀριστερός
ἀδελφός	ἔμπελος	ἄρτος
ἀθρόος	ἀνεμος	ἄσκος
ἀετός	ἀνθρωπος	αὐλός

From this I think you will see that the improvement in vocabulary for which I plead is not unnecessary. I hold in my hand a word-list compiled by the Classical Department at Princeton to be placed in the hands of Freshmen upon entering college. The students are told that the first vocabulary embraces a minimum list of words which they are supposed to know on coming. I mention this merely as showing that the student's knowledge of words is felt by the department to be inadequate, for the action of the department in preparing the list was prompted by such a feeling.

It may be said that, the requirements for entrance being what they are, there is no time available for such systematic attention to vocabulary as that for which I plead. To that I should say, in the first place, that I believe that the student would in the end cover his Anabasis so much more quickly, if proper attention were given to vocabulary, that the time now available would prove ample. In the second place, *if* the time should not be ample, I believe that the universities would accept less Anabasis and Homer, if they could only obtain the other more valuable mastery of word and phrase which would enable the student to go on with his college Greek in a more satisfactory manner. There is, of course, nothing sacred about the four books of the Anabasis. I believe that even now excellence in Grammar and Composition would be allowed by most of the universities to compensate for deficiency in Homer and Anabasis.

I have ventured to make the above recommendations for a better approach to Greek because I have found in my experience as a teacher of Greek at two universities that the present method of preparing students is inadequate, and I believe that the inadequacy is due in large measure to the lack of proper attention to vocabulary. I do not think that we can rely on a mere reading of four books of the Ana-

basis to give the student a satisfactory working vocabulary. What we are asked to do in the universities, and what we want to do, is to teach Greek as literature, and that from the very beginning. But this we cannot do if we have to spend much time in teaching words and forms. Literature is noble thought in noble form, and of the two nobilities the noble form is the essential nobility. To elaborate this point would require a separate paper. Forms are apprehended by the intellect, form, noble form, makes its appeal to the spirit. We want in the universities to get the student on beyond the point where Greek touches the intellect to where it touches the spirit, and helps to produce the 'by-product' of character.

To do this to a greater degree one thing that is necessary, one thing that is indispensable, is greater facility in reading. If a student were to master such a body of words and phrases as I have here spoken of, I believe his facility in reading would be greatly increased.

D. A. MACRAE

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

REVIEW

A Short History of Greek Literature, from Homer to Julian. By Wilmer Cave Wright. New York: American Book Company (1907). Pp. 543.

Mrs. Wright's study of Julian and her reviews of classical books which have appeared at sundry times in the Nation have revealed her independence of judgment, her marked literary skill, and the breadth and catholicity of her learning. She was admirably equipped to write a manual of Greek literature, and the work which we have before us is, as one would have confidently expected, well done. In the brief space of 517 pages we have a lucid survey of Greek literature down to Julian, divided into twenty-three well-selected chapters, each chapter accompanied by a serviceable bibliography of editions, important monographs and articles, and translations. At the end is a full chronological table, followed by a good index.

The author has endeavored to adapt the treatise to "the reader who, though little or not at all acquainted with the classics, realizes that he cannot appreciate any other literature, least of all his own, unless he can relate its masterpieces to the types set, once for all, by the Greeks", and "the student of Greek who, in his second or third year at college, will profit immensely by a rapid survey of the whole field of Greek literature". In spite of the often conflicting needs and limitations of these two classes of readers Mrs. Wright has succeeded in giving us an account of Greek literature that, to a greater extent than any other book of the kind in English, satisfies the legitimate demands of both. It is not a book for the general public—it is too scholarly for that; nor for the indolent or ill-trained college student—it is

too serious and thoughtful for members of the "undesirable class". Its appeal is rather to the men and women of culture, in and out of college, who need a competent guide through the ten centuries in which the Greek race developed and brought to perfection the great permanent types of literature and laid the foundations for the intellectual life of modern Europe.

Mrs. Wright's literary estimates are clearly her own, and are set forth in a style so attractive that one is tempted not to criticize even if he does not accept her view. But a tendency is detected here and there to assume that the author's judgment and taste are more widely shared by others than is the case. The strictures upon the faults of Thucydidean style (p. 182) are fair enough, though perhaps given too great prominence. But in the statement with which the paragraph opens, "All praise, but few enjoy, Thucydides", the author falls into the manner of the essayist rather than of the historian of literature. And the statement cannot be accepted as true. The unfavorable estimate of Euripides (p. 239) is likewise fortified by assertions that are not historically correct. The standing of Euripides with his contemporaries as revealed in the *Frogs* shows that he was not "out of sympathy with his time and with the average Athenian". Compare p. 298, where Euripides is properly called "the delight of the Athenian stage". His victories in the contests probably numbered, not five, but, as the Vatican MS. states, fifteen; five may have been the number of his victories at the Dionysia alone. The criticism of Polybius is introduced by the assertion that "he is not read". As literature? Neither is Mommsen, nor Eduard Meyer. In spite of his obvious faults of style, which are here well catalogued, is it fair to urge against him that he "used the common dialect with all its neologisms" which were to be so carefully avoided by the later purists?—the first approach to the language of St. Paul? Are we bidden at this day to accept the standards of the Atticist reactionaries? We are nowhere given a clear account, by the way, of what Atticism was, nor of its far-reaching influence. The Alexandrian scholars are generally referred to with the respect which is due them, though their work is not summarized anywhere; but we regret that Pope's ignorant witticism is invoked on page 487 without at least a note of disapproval. There were Alexandrians and Alexandrians.

The most difficult chapter in the book to write is in a sense the most successful—that on Homer. The long history of the Homeric question is traced dispassionately and sanely. It would be difficult to direct the student to a better discussion of it any-

¹ "Antiseptic" (p. 45) and "unchaperoned" (p. 286) are interesting neologisms in criticism, but both objectionable because not illuminating but misleading.